UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,300	07/12/2001	Thomas Joshua Shafron	694231/0006	2075

7590 09/20/2004	EXAMINER
Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP	JACOBS, LASHONDA T
180 Maiden Lane	

	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
New York, NY 10038	2157	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _04 May 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-31,33-61 and 63-84_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-31,33-61 and 63-84_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _May 4, 2004_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This is a Final Rejection Office Action in response to Applicants' amendment filed on

May 4, 2004. Claims 1-31, 33-61 and 63-84 are presented for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-12, 14, 16-21, 23, 30, 36-37, 39, 41-43, 45, 47-49, 56, 63-71

and 73-75 and 77-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Shelton et al (hereinafter, "Shelton", 5,954,798) in view of Craig.

As per claims 1, 23, 36, and 49, Shelton discloses a method and system for enabling

a first computer to communicate and exchange data with a second computer, the first

computer and the second computer each having a browser and being in communication

with each other via a network, said method and system comprising:

- downloading, to the first computer, computer code comprising a first script

  operable in connection with the first computer for accessing a function of a first

  control loaded on the first computer for operation in conjunction with said first

  computer browser, the first script being further operable for receiving data input

  by a user of the first computer and for causing the first control to communicate

with the server and to transmit the data input by the user to the server, wherein

the first script and the first control are separate components (abstract, col. 4,

lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44 and col. 7, lines 25-41);

- enabling the user of the first computer to communicate with the second computer

  to present a request for synchronization with the user of the first computer, the

  second computer having a second script and a second control loaded thereon and

  operable in connection therewith for operation in conjunction with said second

  computer browser, wherein the second script and the second control are separate

  components (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44 and col. 7, lines 25-

  41);

- enabling the user of the second computer to agree to synchronize with the user of

  the first computer (col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19);

- enabling the user of the first computer to synchronize with the user of the second

  computer (col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19);

- controlling Internet navigation of the second computer based upon Internet

  navigation of the first computer (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44,

  col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19); and

- causing the server to transmit the data received from the first script to the second

  computer for receipt by the second control (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5,

  lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

However, Shelton does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the first script and the first control and the second script and the second control are independent from Web pages that are displayed on the first computer and the second computer.

Craig discloses a system for providing a synchronized display of information slides on a plurality of computer workstations over a computer network including:

- wherein the first script and the first control and the second script and the second control are independent from Web pages that are displayed on the first computer and the second computer (col. 3, lines 6-29, col. 8, lines 28-51, col. 10, lines 13-39 and col. 14, lines 22-31).

Given the teaching of Craig, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shelton by downloading scripts and controls separately from the web page in order to synchronize the communication of URLs, that identify slide locations to an instructor applet and one or more student applets in timely and efficient manner.

As per claims **11**, and **42**, Shelton further discloses:

- downloading, to the second computer, second computer code comprising a second script operable in connection with the second computer for accessing a function of a second control loaded on the second computer for operation in conjunction with said second computer browser , the second script being further operable for receiving data input by user of the second computer, wherein the second script and the second control are separate components (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

However, Shelton does not explicitly disclose:

- <u>wherein the first script and the first control and the second script and the second control are independent from Web pages that are displayed on the first computer and the second computer.</u>

Craig discloses a system for providing a synchronized display of information slides on a plurality of computer workstations over a computer network including:

- <u>wherein the first script and the first control and the second script and the second control are independent from Web pages that are displayed on the first computer and the second computer</u> (col. 3, lines 6-29, col. 8, lines 28-51, col. 10, lines 13-39 and col. 14, lines 22-31).

Given the teaching of Craig, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shelton by downloading scripts and controls separately from the web page in order to synchronize the communication of URLs, that identify slide locations to an instructor applet and one or more student applets in timely and efficient manner.

As per claims **63** and **74**, Shelton further discloses:

- downloading, to the first computer, computer code comprising a first script, wherein the script is written in a Web-based scripting language, operable in connection with the first computer for accessing a function of a first control for operation in conjunction with said first computer browser, wherein the control is written in a programming language and is compiled, the control being loaded on the first computer the script being further operable for receiving data input by user of the first computer and for causing the first control to communicate with a server and to transmit data input by the user to the server, wherein the first script

and the first control are separate components (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

However, Shelton does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the first script and the first control and the second script and the second control are independent from Web pages that are displayed on the first computer and the second computer.

Craig discloses a system for providing a synchronized display of information slides on a plurality of computer workstations over a computer network including:

- wherein the first script and the first control and the second script and the second control are independent from Web pages that are displayed on the first computer and the second computer (col. 3, lines 6-29, col. 8, lines 28-51, col. 10, lines 13-39 and col. 14, lines 22-31).

Given the teaching of Craig, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shelton by downloading scripts and controls separately from the web page in order to synchronize the communication of URLs, that identify slide locations to an instructor applet and one or more student applets in timely and efficient manner.

As per claim **73**, Shelton further discloses:

defining in a database in the server a synchronization group (col. 6, lines 52-53), and wherein the function of the first control comprises;

- a login function to enable the user of the first and second computer to login to a synchronization group (col. 11, lines 33-48);

- a synchronization function to enable the user of the first and second computer to synchronize with a member of the synchronization group (col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19); and

- a navigation function to enable control of the Internet navigation of a computer of the member of the synchronization group based upon the Internet navigation of the first computer (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

However, Shelton does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the first script and the first control and the second script and the second control are independent from Web pages that are displayed on the first computer and the second computer.

Craig discloses a system for providing a synchronized display of information slides on a plurality of computer workstations over a computer network including:

- wherein the first script and the first control and the second script and the second control are independent from Web pages that are displayed on the first computer and the second computer (col. 3, lines 6-29, col. 8, lines 28-51, col. 10, lines 13-39 and col. 14, lines 22-31).

Given the teaching of Craig, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shelton by downloading scripts and controls separately from the web page in order to synchronize the communication of URLs, that identify slide locations to an instructor applet and one or more student applets in timely and efficient manner.

As per claims **4**, **66** and **77**, Shelton discloses:

- wherein the first script can display data output to the user of the first computer

  (col. 3, lines 1-14, and lines 20-42).

As per claim **16**, Shelton further discloses:

- wherein the second script can display data output to the user of the first

  computer.

As per claims **2, 12, 39, 64** and **75**, Shelton discloses:

- wherein the computer code further comprises the first control.

As per claims **14** and **45**, Shelton discloses:

- wherein the second computer code further comprises the second control (col. 1,

  lines 54-67, col. 3, lines 20-23, and Fig. 1).

As per claims **8, 20, 41, 47,** and **48**, Shelton discloses:

- wherein the first script is operable in connection with the first computer by

  opening a web page containing the first script (col. 3, lines 33-42, and col. 4,

  lines 18-26), and

- wherein the second script is operable in connection with the second computer by

  opening a web page containing the second script (col. 3, lines 63-67, col. 4, lines

  1-5, and lines 18-26).

As per claims **9, 21, 37, 43** and **71**, Shelton discloses wherein the server has defined

in a database thereon a synchronization group (col. 3, lines 58-63), wherein the function

of the first and second control comprises:

- a login function to enable the user of the first and second computer to login to a

  synchronization group (col. 11, lines 33-48);

- a synchronization function to enable the user of the first and second computer to synchronize with a member of the synchronization group (col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19); and

- a navigation function to enable control of the Internet navigation of a computer of the member of the synchronization group based upon the Internet navigation of the first computer (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

As per claims **6, 18, 65, 68** and **79**, Shelton discloses:

- wherein the first script can call a function of the first control (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

As per claims **5, 7, 17, 19, 67** and **78**, Shelton discloses:

- wherein the first script can send data to and receive data from the first control (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19), and

- wherein the second script can send data to and receive data from the second control (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

As per claims **30** and **56**, Shelton further discloses:

- the step of enabling the user of the second computer to login to a synchronization group (col. 11, lines 33-48).

As per claims **69** and **80**, Shelton discloses:

- wherein the first script can send data to and receive data from the function of the first control (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

As per claims **70** and **81**, Shelton discloses:

- wherein the first script is operable in connection with the first computer by opening a Web page containing the first script (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

As per claim **82**, Shelton discloses:

- a login function to enable the user of the first computer to login to a coupling group(col. 11, lines 33-48); and

- a coupling function to enable the user of the first computer to couple with a member of the coupling group (col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

As per claim **83**, Shelton discloses:

- wherein the function of the first control further comprises a navigation function to enable control of the Internet navigation of a computer of the member of the coupling group based upon the Internet navigation of the first computer (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

3.   Claims **10, 22, 24, 34, 38, 44, 50, 58, 60, 72** and **84** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shelton in view of Craig and in further view of Bauer, Jr. et al (hereinafter, "Bauer", US 2002/0083134).

As per claims **10, 22, 38, 44** and **72,** Shelton in view of Craig discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Shelton in view of Craig does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the function of the first control further comprises an instant message function to enable a user of the first computer to send an instant message to a member of the synchronization group, and

- wherein the function of the second control further comprises an instant message function to enable the user of the second computer to send an instant message to a member of the synchronization group.

Bauer discloses a method and system of collaborative browsing including:

- wherein the function of the first control further comprises an instant message function to enable a user of the first computer to send an instant message to a member of the synchronization group (paragraphs 0034 and 0046-0048); and

- wherein the function of the second control further comprises an instant message function to enable the user of the second computer to send an instant message to a member of the synchronization group (paragraphs 0034 and 0046-0048).

Given the teaching of Bauer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate or implement an instant messaging function in Shelton in view of Craig in order to allow clients to chat, send private messages and communicate with other freely.

As per claim **24,** Shelton in view of Craig discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Shelton in view of Craig does not explicitly disclose:

- the step of enabling the user of the first computer to send an instant message to the user of the second computer.

Bauer discloses a method and system of collaborative browsing including:

- the step of enabling the user of the first computer to send an instant message to the user of the second computer (paragraphs 0034 and 0046-0048).

Given the teaching of Bauer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate or implement an instant messaging function in Shelton in view of Craig in order to allow clients to chat, send private messages and communicate with other freely.

As per claim **34**, Shelton in view of Craig discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Shelton in view of Craig does not explicitly disclose:

- the step of enabling the user of the second computer to send an instant message to the user of the first computer.

Bauer discloses a method and system of collaborative browsing including:

- the step of enabling the user of the second computer to send an instant message to the user of the first computer (paragraphs 0034 and 0046-0048).

Given the teaching of Bauer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate or implement an instant messaging function in Shelton in view of Craig in order to allow clients to chat, send private messages and communicate with other freely.

As per claims **50**, **58**, and **60**, Shelton in view of Craig discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Shelton in view of Craig does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein said processor being further operable in connection with software to enable the user of the first and second computer to send an instant message to a member of the synchronization group.

Bauer discloses a method and system of collaborative browsing including:

- wherein said processor being further operable in connection with software to enable the user of the first and second computer to send an instant message to a member of the synchronization group (paragraphs 0024, 0034 and 0046-0048).

Given the teaching of Bauer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate or implement an instant messaging function in Shelton in view of Craig in order to allow clients to chat, send private messages and communicate with other freely.

As per claim **84**, Shelton in view of Craig discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Shelton in view of Craig does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the function of the first control further comprises an instant message function to enable a user of the first computer to send an instant message to a member of the coupling group.

Bauer discloses a method and system of collaborative browsing including:

- wherein the function of the first control further comprises an instant message function to enable a user of the first computer to send an instant message to a member of the coupling group (paragraphs 0034 and 0046-0048).

Given the teaching of Bauer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate or implement an instant messaging function in Shelton in view of Craig in order to allow clients to chat, send private messages and communicate with other freely.

4.   Claims 3, 13, 15, 25- 28, 31, 33, 40, 46, 51-55, 57, 61 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shelton in view of Craig and in further view of Lee et al (hereinafter, "Lee", US 2002/0035603).

As per claims 3, 13, 15, 40, 46 and 76, Shelton in view of Craig discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Shelton in view of Craig does not explicitly disclose:

• wherein the first and second control comprises an ActiveX control.

Lee discloses a method for collaborative browsing using transformation of URL including:

• wherein the first and second control comprises an ActiveX control (paragraphs 0028-0030).

Given the teaching of Lee, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shelton in view of Craig by allowing the web browser to download an active control supporting collaborating browsing allowing clients to view the same URL at one time.

As per claims 25, 31, 51, and 57, Shelton in view of Craig discloses:

- providing a script that accepts data input from the user of the first and second computer (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19);

- a login function that generates a login identification and that receives the data input to the script from the user of the first computer, transmitting the data input and login identification to the server, receiving login confirmation or rejection from the server and passing the login confirmation or rejection data to the script (col. 11, lines 33-48).

- However, Shelton in view of Craig does not explicitly teach an ActiveX control.

Lee discloses a method for collaborative browsing using transformation of URL including:

- an ActiveX control (paragraphs 0028-0030).

Given the teaching of Lee, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shelton in view of Craig by allowing the web browser to download an active control supporting collaborating browsing allowing clients to view the same URL at one time.

As per claims **26, 33, 52, 55** and **61**, Shelton in view of Craig discloses:

- providing a script that accepts data input from the user of user of the first and second computer (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

However, Shelton in view of Craig does not explicitly teach the steps of:

- wherein a script creates an XML feed of the data; and

- providing an ActiveX control defining a synchronization identification and that
  receives the XML feed from the script, the ActiveX control transmitting the
  XML feed and synchronization identification to the server.

Lee discloses a method for collaborative browsing using transformation of URL
including:

- wherein the script creates an XML feed of the data (paragraphs 0028-0031); and

- providing an ActiveX control defining a synchronization identification and that
  receives the XML feed from the script, the ActiveX control transmitting the
  XML feed and synchronization identification to the server (paragraphs 0028-
  0031).

Given the teaching of Lee, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in
the art to modify Shelton in view of Craig by allowing the web browser to download an
active control supporting collaborating browsing allowing clients to view the same URL
at one time.

As per claims **27** and **53**, Shelton in view of Craig discloses:

- providing a browser helper object (BHO) control for receiving a navigation
  message from the Internet browser when the user of the first computer navigates
  from a first Internet web page to a second Internet web page (abstract, col. 4,
  lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13,
  lines 1-19);

- providing a script for receiving the navigation message from the BHO control
  (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11, lines
  33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

However, Shelton in view of Craig does not explicitly teach the steps of:

- creating an XML feed of navigation message; and

- providing an ActiveX control defining a synchronization identification and that
  receives the XML feed from the script, the ActiveX control transmitting the
  XML feed and synchronization identification to the server to control the Internet
  navigation of the second computer based upon the Internet navigation of the first
  computer.

Lee discloses a method for collaborative browsing using transformation of URL
including:

- creating an XML feed of navigation message (paragraphs 0028-0031); and

- providing an ActiveX control defining a synchronization identification and that
  receives the XML feed from the script, the ActiveX control transmitting the
  XML feed and synchronization identification to the server to control the Internet
  navigation of the second computer based upon the Internet navigation of the first
  computer (paragraphs 0028-0031).

Given the teaching of Lee, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in
the art to modify Shelton in view of Craig by allowing the web browser to download an
active control supporting collaborating browsing allowing clients to view the same URL
at one time.

As per claims **28** and **54**, Shelton in view of Craig discloses:

- wherein the navigation message comprises a URL for the second internet web
  page (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-41, col. 11,
  lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

5.   Claims **29, 35** and **59** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Shelton in view of Craig and in further view of Bauer and in further view of Lee et

al (hereinafter, "Lee", US 2002/0035603).

As per claims **29, 35** and **59**, Shelton in view of Craig and in further view of Bauer

discloses:

- providing a script that accepts data input from the user of user of the first and

  second computer (abstract, col. 4, lines 28-67, col. 5, lines 1-44, col. 7, lines 25-

  41, col. 11, lines 33-48 and col. 13, lines 1-19).

However, Shelton in view of Craig and in further view of Bauer does not explicitly

teach the steps of:

- wherein a script creates an XML feed of the data; and

- providing an ActiveX control defining a synchronization identification and that

  receives the XML feed from the script, the ActiveX control transmitting the

  XML feed and synchronization identification to the server.

Lee discloses a method for collaborative browsing using transformation of URL

including:

- wherein the script creates an XML feed of the data (paragraphs 0028-0031); and

- providing an ActiveX control defining a synchronization identification and that

  receives the XML feed from the script, the ActiveX control transmitting the

  XML feed and synchronization identification to the server (paragraphs 0028-

  0031).

Given the teaching of Lee, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to modify Shelton in view of Craig and in further view of Bauer by allowing the

web browser to download an active control supporting collaborating browsing allowing

clients to view the same URL at one time.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-31, 33-61 and 63-84 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

2.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to LaShonda T. Jacobs whose telephone number is 703-305-

7494. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 703-308-7562. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

LaShonda T. Jacobs
Examiner
Art Unit 2157

ltj
September 15, 2004

SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER